

IN THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Attorney Docket No.: **HA-59APPCON (HAL-ID 094APPCON)**

Appl. No.: **10/617,605**

Applicants: **Larry Pearlstein**

Filed: **July 11, 2003**

TC/A.U.: **2621**

Examiner: **Tung T. Vo**

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

AND

SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

This Interview Summary and Supplemental Reply is submitted as a statement of the Substance of the in-person Interview conducted June 25, 2008 and follows submission of a Reply on April 30, 2008 to the Final Office action dated January 30, 2008.

In the interview the Examiner agreed to withdraw the finality of the previous Office Action in response to Applicant's arguments.

I. STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

This interview summary is presented in the format suggested by the Patent Office.

- 1. Date of Interview: June 25, 2008**

2. **Type of Interview:** In-Person
3. **Name of Participants:**
Examiner: Tung T. Vo
Applicants' Rep: Michael P. Straub
4. **Exhibit(s) Shown:** None
5. **Claims discussed:** Claim 23
6. **References Discussed:**
US Patent No. 5,530,481 (the De With et al. patent)
US Patent No 6,014,466 (the Xia et al. patent)
7. **Proposed Amendments discussed:**
None.
8. **Discussion of General Thrust
of the Principal Arguments**

Applicant argued that that the applied references alone or in combination did not disclose the claimed subject matter of any of the pending claims for the reasons discussed in the previously submitted Reply. In particular it was argued with regard to claim 23, for example, the applied references did not teach or suggest the claim features indicated in bold below.

A video processing method comprising the steps of:
receiving encoded video data
representing a series of images, said encoded video data having been encoded using motion compensated prediction on at least some of the images being encoded, each encoded image in said series of images including a first predetermined contiguous image area and a second predetermined contiguous image area, **each of said first and second predetermined contiguous image areas being smaller than a full area of an image in said series of images, motion vectors for the first predetermined contiguous image areas using for predictions**

only pixels within first predetermined contiguous image areas, each of said first predetermined contiguous image areas being located at the same location in each of said series of images, said same location having been determined prior to encoding; and decoding said received encoded video data.

It was further argued that the other claims were not anticipated or rendered obvious for similar reasons to the reasons discussed with regard to claim 23 and that the rejection of all the claims should therefore be withdrawn.

9. Other Pertinent Matters Discussed: None

10. General Results/Outcome of Interview

The Examiner indicated that he would withdraw the finality of the previous office action and conduct an updated search. Applicant's representative thanked the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the application and applied references.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes the previously submitted Reply to the Final Office action should have been considered responsive and tolled the deadline for responding to the Final Office Action. However, if for any reason that is not the case, it is requested that this document be considered a Reply to the

Final Office Action. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made and any required fee in regard to the extension or this amendment is authorized to be charged to the deposit account of Straub & Pokotylo, deposit account number 50-1049.

None of the statements or discussion made herein are intended to be an admission that any of the applied references are prior art to the present application and Applicants preserve the right to establish that one or more of the applied references are not prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Michael P. Straub", is written over a horizontal line.

June 28, 2008

Michael P. Straub Attorney
Reg. No. 36,941
Tel.: (732) 936-1400